

III. Remarks

Responsive to the outstanding Examiner's Action, applicants have carefully studied the Examiner's comments. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the following detailed discussion.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 and 20 are allowed. Claims 6-19 have been rejected.

Claims 6-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated claim 6 is unclear since the phrase "can absorb to brake said vehicle" should be a separate step and should be correlated with the "providing a braking signal..." step.

Counsel for applicants and the Examiner spoke on the phone on June 7, 2005 regarding the above rejection. The amendment to claim 6 presented above was proposed to and discussed with the Examiner. Counsel for applicants indicated that amended claim 6 now overcomes the Examiner's rejection since the "providing a braking signal" step is separate from the "braking said vehicle" step. The "braking said vehicle" step correlates to the "providing a brake signal" step as requested by the Examiner.

In light of the remarks and amendment above, it is believed the claims are now in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/677,888

1-16234

6864 HURB

Should the Examiner wish to modify any of the language of the claims, applicants' attorney suggests a telephone interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen H. Evans

Registration No. 47,281

ATTORNEYS

Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate, Eighth Floor
Toledo, OH 43604
ph: (419) 249-7100
fax: (419) 249-7151